

To: Card, Joan[Card.Joan@epa.gov]; McGrath, Shaun[McGrath.Shaun@epa.gov]
Cc: R8 Documentation Unit Leader[R08_Documentation_Unit_Leader@epa.gov]
From: Hestmark, Martin
Sent: Tue 9/15/2015 6:57:40 PM
Subject: FW: Gold King Interim Water Treatment Plant -----results of EPA technical panel evaluation

FYI

From: Ostrander, David
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 12:57 PM
To: Hestmark, Martin
Cc: Guy, Kerry; Williams, Laura
Subject: RE: Gold King Interim Water Treatment Plant -----results of EPA technical panel evaluation

We just received a \$6 mil advice of allowance from HQ based on previous cost projections. This proposal is about 130k to mobilize and set up and about \$15k a week to operate. The proposal required a 21 day mobilization and startup to treating water.

From: Hestmark, Martin
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 12:52 PM
To: Ostrander, David
Cc: Guy, Kerry; Williams, Laura
Subject: RE: Gold King Interim Water Treatment Plant -----results of EPA technical panel evaluation

How much will it cost for the AEG proposal to get built? How long will it take? Is it a operate and build proposal? Do we need to forward the proposal to OEM Mgt? So they are ready with \$?

From: Ostrander, David
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 11:36 AM
To: McGrath, Shaun; Card, Joan; Hestmark, Martin
Subject: FW: Gold King Interim Water Treatment Plant -----results of EPA technical panel evaluation

Just wanted to let you know we are ready with evaluations of bids and can award a contract for water treatment if the decision is made to do so.

From: Guy, Kerry

Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 11:28 AM

To: Ostrander, David

Subject: Gold King Interim Water Treatment Plant -----results of EPA technical panel evaluation

Gold King Interim Water Treatment Plant

A request for proposal to mobilize an interim water treatment plant to treat the Gold King discharge of between treat discharges of 600 gpm (up to 1200) was sent out by EPA's ERRs contractor on August 21st with bids due back on August 26. Six bidders submitted proposals. These initial six proposals were evaluated and ranked by an EPA technical panel using an evaluation matrix with four broad criteria including company experience on similar sites, ability to meet the 21 day time period (mobilize and begin treating water), technical approach, and reviewers supporting comments. The top three rated bidders (short list) were then selected for interviews. A second matrix, more detailed, was prepared to facilitate the interview process and rate the bidder's ability to: bring the right experience to the site; meet the mob, install, and setup time frame; and meet the performance criteria. Interviews, via phone conference, with the three firms on the short list were conducted on September 4th. The results of each EPA technical panel's matrix ratings were then consolidated onto a final score sheet. Although each of the three firms on the short list provided strong proposals, one firm (AEG) stood out among the rankings based on their experience and technical approach.

Two attachments are included with this email. The first (Bid Evaluation Matrices) is the initial matrix by the EPA technical panel used to develop the initial short list from the initial six bidders. The second attachment (Compiled Interview Ratings) provides the final matrix scores of the final three firms along with each technical evaluation panel member's assigned ratings for each of the matrix criteria.

Kerry Guy

Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8

On-Scene Coordinator

Emergency Response Unit

303-312-7288

303-808-3831